

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed 03/08/2005 (hereinafter referred to as the OA) has been received, and its contents carefully studied. The applicant presents this response and amendment which applicant believes is fully responsive to the OA.

The applicant further believes that for the reasons set out below, the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests consideration for same.

Rejections Under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-15 have been rejected under a combination of Burns (6,048,269) and Reber (5,969,324). Applicant respectfully traverses for the reasons set out below.

Claims 1-15 (all the current pending claims) include independent claims 1, 6, 10 and 12. The independent claims will be discussed first. Applicant believes the cited combination does not teach the presently claimed invention for the following reasons.

Burns does not disclose a transaction identifier generated by (originating by) an exchange terminal as stated on page 2, second-to-last line, of the OA. Burns not disclosing exchange terminal or player terminals that originate (generate) transaction

identifiers is supported in the OA on page 3 starting at line 5, so the statement on page 2 appears to be a typographical error. Burns' transaction identifiers are generated on his backend system (called a "CPU" in Burns disclosure); this aspect of Burns was covered extensively in Applicant's previous office action response, and is referenced herein rather than being reproduced here to avoid clutter.

Burns also does not have player terminals that determine transaction identifiers as stated in the OA (page 3, lines 4-5). Burns' backend system is where transaction identifiers are determined, as is stated on page 3 lines 5-10 of the OA; the earlier statement appears to be a typo. This aspect of Burns' system (generation of transaction identifiers only on his backend system) was discussed in Applicant's previous office action response, including cites in Burns; the discussion is hereby referenced rather than reproduced to avoid clutter.

Reber is asserted as supplying missing elements from Burns on page 3, starting at line 10, of the OA. That is followed by a statement that the combining of Burns and Reber is obvious. Applicant respectfully traverses both statements, explained below.

Reber teaches an accounting system, where all actions covered in the description occur after a transaction is completed (see generally the Abstract and figs. 2 and 7). Reber's goal is to make post-transaction accounting easy (col. 1, lines 30-50; the type of post-transaction information which Reber discloses can be seen in figs. 2-6, which is used to generate expense reports such as shown in fig 11). Reber does not teach or disclose

on-going transactions, series of transactions, or the use of gaming machine values (credit or award values which are usable to play gaming machines and have an associated cash value). Reber teaches a point-of-sale (POS) terminal which can generate, but not extract, a transaction number sent to a backend database along with completed transaction information (col. 3, 37-51 teaches a POS terminal that can generate a transaction number; fig. 7 corresponds to the description for information retrieval which teaches the use of a different machine [not a POS terminal] for retrieval).

Further, Reber only teaches and discloses POS terminals and a user-located data reader hooked to a computer (see fig. 1), for passive (non-value) information. There is no suggestion or teaching towards any kind of gaming system (nor would Reber's system have applicability to a gaming system), nor towards the saving and retrieval of any type of value usable on a gaming machine, nor any terminal (gaming or not) that can both generate and retrieve transaction identifiers. Reber's retrieval system has a reader (fig. 1, 54) that passes the bar code data to the database server (computer 44, fig. 1, col. 8 lines 30-54). The reader is a pass-through device; Reber does not teach any end-device that can retrieve a transaction identifier from the bar code data. If the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assessment of Reber, Applicant respectfully requests specific cites to Reber teaching the above mentioned aspects found in Applicant's claimed invention.

Assuming, *arguendo*, there is a teaching to combine Burns and Reber, the combination does not teach all the claimed elements in each pending independent claim

or their functional relationship to each other. Missing elements include (but are not limited to):

a player terminal enabled to play a game and to both generate, and retrieve, transaction identifiers.

Those elements are not found in either Burns or Reber, nor in the combination, and are present in each pending independent claim.

Applicant also believes it would not have been obvious to combine Reber and Burns. Reber teaches an accounting system used to store passive information, the passive information (completed, post-transaction information) usable to load spreadsheets. Reber's system is also not a real-time system; it was purposely designed for a single data retrieval at some point later in time, where the information he stores is expected to sit for extended periods of time before use (i.e., later retrieval for filling in expense reports). Reber does not address live credits, nor teaches or addresses on-going, real-time transactions. The present invention is to the use of credits/awards in a gaming environment, needed to be retrievable for use in gaming machines (player terminals) in a dynamic, real-time environment. A person of ordinary skill in gaming arts at the time of the inception of the present invention, which was designed to deal with live gaming machines in a dynamic gaming environment and dealing with live credits (having game play value, and a cash equivalent value) which comprise an on-going transaction, would not be drawn to look at accounting/spreadsheet solutions dealing with post-transaction, passive, non-real-time information storage. The system requirements (design requirements) are not the same for at least the reasons just indicated, with Reber having no applicable teachings to gaming systems.

Each pending dependent claim (2-5 from 1; 7-9 from 6; 11 from 10; and 13-15 from 12) has addition elements and subject matter pertaining to patentability compared to the independent claim from which each eventually depends. As each inherits the elements from the independent claim from which it eventually depends, and each pending independent claim is patentable over the cited prior art, the pending dependant claims are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons.

Summary

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in the OA, having shown presently pending claims are patentably distinct over Burns and Reber for several reasons. First, *arguendo*, assuming there is a teaching or suggestion to combine the two cites, the cites are still missing elements found in the presently claimed invention as discussed above. Secondly Applicant believes that due to the divergent nature of the systems involved, including but not limited to the fact that one deals with real-time events and on-going transactions in a gaming environment, while the other deals with very long term, slow, occasional and non-real-time events that are post-transaction and have no redemption or cash value, a person of ordinary skill in the gaming arts at the time of the invention would not look to accounting systems for teachings.

Applicant respectfully requests consideration for allowance of the presently pending claims.

Conclusion

It is believed that this office action response and amendment is responsive to the OA and places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Please feel free to contact the undersigned attorney with any questions to clarify any aspect of this response.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: *06-Oct-05*

Russ F. Marsden
Reg. No. 43,775

Russ F. Marsden
Alliance Gaming, Inc.
Bally Systems, Inc.
6601 South Bermuda Rd.
Las Vegas, NV 89119
Phone: 702-896-7930